

REMARKS

Applicants elect Group I, claims 1-21, for immediate examination.

Applicants elect species A, the embodiment of Figure 1, for immediate examination.

Applicants elect species **a**, the embodiment wherein the length of the charges is selected, for immediate examination.

At least claims 1-21, 23-24, and 26-37 are readable on the elected species A.

All claims are readable on the elected species **a**.

The restriction requirement is traversed.

Claims 1-25 are all directed to a "gas generator ... for well stimulation." It is respectfully submitted that the examiner's classification of claims 1-21 in class 102 (ammunition and explosives) and claims 22-25 in class 166 (wells) is unreasonable on its face.

As between groups I and II, the examiner contends that the combination as claimed [in claims 22-25] does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed [in claims 1-21] for patentability. As regards claim 22, which is dependent from claim 1, this is incorrect as a matter of law, see 35 U.S.C. § 112, fourth paragraph. As regards claims 23 and 24-25, the examiner is requested to identify the necessary features of the gas generator claimed in claim 1 that are not required for patentability of the gas generators claimed in claims 23 and 24. Absent such identification, the examiner has not shown distinctness between Groups I and II.

The examiner further contends that the gas generator of claim 1 "has separate utility such as a gas generator for an air bag. The examiner has shown no reason why the gas generator of claims 22-25 could not equally be used in an air bag. Thus, the proposed utility is not separate, and does not support a finding of distinctness of Groups I and II.

As between Group III and the other groups of claims, the examiner contends that the product can be made by a process "wherein the igniter is located on the outer surface of the central channel." It is noted that this contention does not apply to claims 8-10, 22, and 25. The examiner further contends that the process of claims 26-33 "can be used to make ... a gas generator employing a liquid-propellant." It is respectfully pointed out that claims 26-33 are directed to a "method of assembling a **solid-propellant** gas generator (emphasis added).

As between Group IV and the other groups of claims, it is respectfully submitted that the different process proposed by the examiner is not reasonable.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the restriction requirement and examination of all claims in the present application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ALEXANDER S. ZHARKOV et al.

By: 

DANIEL A. MONACO
Registration No. 30,480
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
One Logan Square
18th & Cherry Streets
Philadelphia, PA 19103-6996
Tel: (215) 988-3312
Fax: (215) 988-2757

Attorney for Applicants